

Serial No.: 10/066,529
Attorney Docket No.: 100201207-1

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated May 7, 2004, claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 10-12 have been amended. Claims 1-22 are in the case. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 4, 5, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In response, the Applicants have amended claims 4, 5, 10 and 11 as suggested by the Examiner to overcome this rejection.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-8, 10-12-19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barbour et al. (EP 1029674A2) in view of Nozawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,499,821).

The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because Barbour et al. in combination with Nozawa do not disclose all of the Applicant's features of each of the claims. Namely, the combination of the cited references do not disclose or allow for the possibility of using "a nominal operating pulse width, the signal from the sensor, the optimal operating temperature, the ejection history of the ejection elements and the printhead operating parameters from the memory device for calculating an adjusted pulse width and to create a dynamic estimate of a current temperature distribution across the printhead assembly" of claim 1, "determining an optimal operating temperature of the printhead as a dynamic estimate of a current temperature distribution across the printhead assembly derived from a thermal response model of the printhead, an ejection history of the ink ejection elements and a current printhead operating temperature" of claim 2, and "determining an optimal operating temperature of the printhead as a dynamic estimate of a current temperature distribution across the printhead assembly derived from a thermal response model of the printhead, an ejection history of the ink ejection elements and a current printhead operating temperature" of claim 12. (Emphasis Added).

Accordingly, Barbour et al. in combination with Nozawa cannot render the claims obvious because the combination is missing using an ejection history of the ink ejection elements to determine an optimal operating temperature or a nominal operating pulse width as a dynamic estimate of a current temperature distribution across the printhead assembly.

With regard to the dependent claims, since they depend from the respective


Serial No.: 10/066,529
Attorney Docket No.: 100201207-1

independent claims argued above and contain additional limitations, they are therefore also patentable at least on the same basis (MPEP § 2143.03).

In view of the arguments and amendments set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejected claims are in immediate condition for allowance. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding claim rejections and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to expedite and further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicants kindly invite the Examiner to telephone the Applicants' attorney at (818) 885-1575. Please note that all correspondence should continue to be directed to:

Hewlett Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,
Dated: August 6, 2004



Edmond A. DeFrank
Reg. No. 37,814
Attorney for Applicant